

| | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/069,291 | NOBLE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Christopher L. Lavin | Art Unit 2621 | |

All Participants:

(1) Christopher L. Lavin.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) Michael J. Shea (Reg. No. 34,725).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 09/13/05

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1 and 52

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

There were several inconsistancies in the applicant's amended material, mainly an inconsistent use of the phrase "shape-space". Applicant agreed to an examiner's amendment to correct the minor problems, as seen in the amendment.

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



BRIAN WERNER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)